

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit: 2814  
Examiner: Mr. Nathan W. Ha

2814  
(N.E.)  
11/Response  
J. Steptan  
5-7-03

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:

Applicant(s): Makoto TERUI et al.

Serial No.: 10/022,268

Filed: December 20, 2001

For: SEMICONDUCTOR PACKAGE AND  
METHOD OF FABRICATING SAME

Docket No: OKI 286

REQUEST FOR  
SUPPLEMENTAL  
OFFICE ACTION

TC 2800 MAIL ROOM

APR 29 2003

RECEIVED

**Attention: BOX AF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Office Action of April 14, 2003 has been received and it is anticipated that a response will be filed in due course. However, supplementation of the Office Action is respectfully requested for the reasons noted below.

Section 2 in the typewritten portion of the Office Action rejects all of the claims on the ground that "all of the newly added limitations such as substantially, causing protrusion, locally roughened render new matter" represent new matter. This rejection is so broad in scope that it would be difficult to respond to it in a meaningful manner. The case contains both amended claims and new claims, and it should be unnecessary for Applicants to have the burden of pointing out support for all of the changes in the old claims and also for all of the wording in the new claims.

It might be thought that specifying "newly added limitations" in the Office Action, and mentioning a few of them, would be sufficient to permit Applicants to identify any further limitations that would come within the scope of the new matter rejection. Not so. The term "substantially," (as in "substantially spherical" in claim 15), is not a new limitation. Instead, it is a relaxation of an old limitation. "Causing protrusion" does not seem to appear in the claims. Is


OK to enter  
Note  
5/12/03  
FEE ENCLOSED: \$  
Please charge any further  
fee to our Deposit Account  
No. 8-0002

the wording in claim 11 intended? The presence of questions regarding two of the three examples provided in the Office Action are sufficient to demonstrate that the examples did not provide a reliable guide that would permit Applicants to identify "all of the newly added limitations" that are allegedly new matter.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the present Office Action be supplemented by a further Office Action that explicitly identifies each limitation that is deemed to be new matter, and at least one claim in which that limitation appears.

Respectfully submitted,

April 25, 2003  
Date

  
Allen Wood - Reg. No. 28,134  
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.  
Telephone: 202-371-8976  
Telefax: 202-408-0924  
CUSTOMER NO. 23995

AW:tlc